



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,186	03/11/2004	Akiko Niimi	119077	4948
25944	7590	04/14/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			CRENSHAW, MARVIN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/797,186

Applicant(s)

NIIMI, AKIKO

Examiner

Marvin P. Crenshaw

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2006.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 16 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 12 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 - 16 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings were received on March 1, 2006. These drawings are accepted.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13 – 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With respect to claim 13, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including at least one of the screen plate and the frame includes at least one of a projection and a groove, and the printing medium supporting member includes the other of the projection and the groove such that when the screen plate and the frame are detachably connected to the printing medium supporting member the at least one projection connects with the at least one groove to lock the screen plate in position relative to the printing medium supporting member.

With respect to claim 16, the prior art does not teach or render obvious the total combination as claimed including a printing device wherein said screen plate comprises a first frame member and at least a pair of second frame members, said frame members of said at least one pair of second frame members opposing one another and slidably engaged with an underside of said first frame member by interlocking grooves.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 4 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koizumi et al. in view of Rodi.

Koizumi et al. teaches a screen plate (See col. 1, lines 24 – 25) fitting detachably onto said supporting face in a state where the printing medium is sandwiched between said screen plate and said supporting face of said printing medium supporting member and an ink-jet head (31) for performing ink-jet printing onto said printing medium.

However, Koizumi et al. does not teach printing device comprising a printing medium supporting member having a supporting face for supporting a printing medium and for transporting the printing medium through a plurality of printing devices of different types.

Art Unit: 2854

Rodi teaches a printing device (Fig.1) comprising a printing medium supporting member (6) having a supporting face for supporting a printing medium (See col. 4, line 19) and for transporting the printing medium through a plurality of printing devices of different types.

It would have been obvious to modify Koizumi et al. teaches that it is desirable to use one medium supporting member for transporting a medium between more than one printing device.

With respect to claim 4, 6 and 7, Koizumi et al. teaches a printing device wherein a plurality of said screen plates (See col. 1, lines 18 – 25) of different types are prepared and a printing device wherein the printing medium is a fabric (See col. 1, lines 14 - 18).

With respect to claim 5, Koizumi et al. does not teach a printing device wherein said printing medium supporting member comprises an adjustment mechanism.

Rodi teaches to have printing device wherein said printing medium supporting member comprises an adjusting mechanism (See Col. 2, lines 45 – 67).

It would have been obvious to modify Koizumi et al. to have a printing device wherein said printing medium supporting member comprises an adjustment mechanism as taught by Rodi to provide a means for adjusting the medium with respect to the ink-jet printhead.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koizumi et al.

With respect to claim 10, Koizumi et al. teaches a printing method comprising the steps of screen printing onto a printing medium using a screen plate (See col. 1, lines 24 – 25) and ink-jet printing (31) by emitting ink of a darker color than the ink used in said screen printing step, onto the screen printed region, from an ink-jet head.

With respect to claim 11, Koizumi et al. teaches a printing method wherein the ink used in said screen printing step is set depending upon the screen plate (See Col. 1, lines 24 – 25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koizumi et al. in view of Rodi and further in view of Siegeritz.

Koizumi et al. in view of Rodi teaches all that is claimed, as discussed in the above rejection of claim 1 except, an ink determining means for determining the density of ink and the color.

Siegeritz teaches a printing device further comprising ink color determining means (See paragraph 0014) for setting the color of the ink used in printing by means of said screen plate to a lighter color than the ink used in printing means of the ink emission section and a printing device wherein said ink color determining means set the color of the ink used in printing by means of the screen plate to white (See paragraph 0067).

It would have been obvious to further modify Koizumi et al. to have an ink determining means for determining and setting the color used in printing to white as taught by Siegeritz so as to provide an efficient means for selecting the color of ink to use for printing.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koizumi et al. in view of Rodi and further in view of Thorpe.

Koizumi et al. teaches a screen plate (See col. 1, lines 24 – 25) fitting detachably onto said supporting face in a state where the printing medium is sandwiched between said screen plate and said supporting face of said printing medium supporting member and an ink-jet head (31) for performing ink-jet printing onto said printing medium.

However, Koizumi et al. does not teach printing device comprising a printing medium supporting member having a supporting face for supporting a printing medium and for transporting the printing medium through a plurality of printing devices of different types.

Rodi teaches a printing device (Fig.1) comprising a printing medium supporting member (6) having a supporting face for supporting a printing medium (See col. 4, line 19) and for transporting the printing medium through a plurality of printing devices of different types.

It would have been obvious to modify Koizumi et al. teaches that it is desirable to use one medium supporting member for transporting a medium between more than one printing device.

With regard to claim 12, Koizumi et al. in view of Rodi does not teach a frame, wherein the screen plate together with the frame have a lock-and-key relationship with the printing medium supporting member.

Thorpe teaches a frame (13) wherein the screen plate (16) together with the frame have a lock-and-key relationship with the printing medium supporting member (Fig.1). This lock and key relationship is achieved by the groove 23 and projection 24.

It would have been obvious to further modify Koizumi et al. to have the screen plate and the frame include at least one projection and a groove as taught by Thorpe to provide a secure means for locking the screen plate to the frame while printing.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed March 1, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 - 16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Koizumi et al. Koizumi et al. teaches a method of screen printing. And Rodi has been added to teach a printing device having the ability to have more than one printing device on a frame (See col. 1, lines 41 - 64) and using one supporting member.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marvin P. Crenshaw whose telephone number is (571) 272-2158. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/797,186
Art Unit: 2854

Page 9

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'MPC', written in a cursive style.

MPC
March 30, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Daniel J. Colilla', written in a cursive style.

Daniel J. Colilla
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854